LVIII.—Note on the Nomenclature of the Short-eared New-Zealand Bat. By Oldfield Thomas.

It has always been a subject of regret that, owing to Gray's error in ascribing to Forster's "Vespertilio tuberculatus" a specimen of the Long-eared Bat of New Zealand, which he then described and made the type of the genus Mystacina, the specific names of the two New-Zealand bats should have been identical, an identity particularly inconvenient to writers on the fauna of that country. It is therefore with some pleasure that I am now able to point out that the names of the two species should after all not both be "tuberculatus."

The Mystacina unquestionably should bear that name; but in the case of the other species, referred in modern times to the genus Chalinolobus, the name tuberculatus has not the priority of publication, although dating in manuscript from the last century. It is now universally recognized that manuscript names do not confer priority, and before Forster's description of 1772-74 was published by Lichtenstein in 1844† a second name had been given to the bat by Dr. Gray, who described a specimen from South Australia as Scotophilus morio‡, and under the latter short and convenient specific name the Chalinolobus should certainly stand.

Instead, therefore, of *Chalinolobus tuberculatus* and *Mystacina tuberculata* we shall have *Chalinolobus morio* and *Mystacina tuberculata* as the two bats of New Zealand, both of them being represented by their type specimens in the

National Collection.

In this connexion it may be pointed out that Chalinolobus signifer, Dobs. \$\forall \text{, from Queensland, is in all probability the same as \$Ch. morio\$, its distinguishing character—the transverse cutaneous lobule on the muzzle—being a mark of old age, especially developed in the male sex, and not of specific distinctness. A male specimen from one of the outlying islands round Stewart Island, New Zealand, recently presented to the Museum by Mr. Charles Traill, has this lobule quite as well marked as in the type of \$Ch. signifer\$, and all the other fully adult specimens of \$Ch. morio\$ in the Museum show some trace of the same lobule, while in immature individuals no sign of it is present.

<sup>Voy. 'Sulphur,' Mamm. p. 23 (1843).
† Forst. Descr. Anim., ed. Licht. p. 62 (1844).
† Gray's Austr., App. ii. p. 405 (1841).
§ Ann. & Mag. Nat. Hist [4] xvii. p. 289 (1876).</sup>